



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

handelt, eben da 554, wo Tobler *par* statt *a* einführt:

"En la fin volantez me vint,
Qu'a mon oste covant tanroie
Et que *par* lui m'an revanroie."

II.

Neben *orb* führt Diez im 'Etymolog. Wörterbuch' *dorp* an, das in keinem unserer Wörterbücher oder glossare zu finden ist und auch schon Mahn bedenklich schien, wozu wohl die schreibung mit *p* beigetragen haben mag. Die ansetzung von *dorp* beruht wohl auf einer falschen auffassung einer stelle, in der das handschriftlich überlieferte wort als *d'orp* aufzufassen ist, wo aber auch eine form *dorp* sinn zu haben schien. Disse stelle ist nun nach meiner auffassung keine andere als ein vers in dem bekannten *enueg* des mönchs von Montaudon (Bartsch, 'Provenzal. Chrestomathie,'⁴ 134, 27-30), wo es heisst:

"et enojam per sant Marti,
trop d'aiga en petit de vi,
e quan trob escassier mati
m'enoja, e *d'orp* atressi."

Diez kann *dorp* recht wohl als plural aufgefasst haben: "und blinde (verdriessen mich) ebenso."

EUGEN LESER.

Berlin.

HILDEBRAND'S THEORY OF ALLITERATION.

THERE has lately appeared, in the *Zeitschrift für den deutschen Unterricht*, vol. v, pp. 577-85, an article entitled "Zum Wesen des Reimes auch des Stabreimes, dabei eine Berichtigung Scherers" in which Rudolf Hildebrand advances a new theory regarding the nature of the so-called Alliteration (Stabreim).

The opening remarks regarding the nature of the German 'Endreim' do not contain much that is really new. "Great stress is laid on the fact that

"Not the like sound only makes a good rime, but a combination of likeness and unlikeness, not the similarity of the vowel only is essential, but also the difference of the consonants preceding the riming vowel."

He then touches very lightly on identical and

¹ See now Hildebrand himself in the January number of the *Zeitschrift*.

'rührende' rimes and their great infrequency in modern German poetry.² It seems, however, as if Hildebrand were too ready to generalize and draw from these observations far reaching conclusions regarding rime in general. It is not true that rime, wherever it appears, 'shows this quality and nature.' The beauty of rime is just as much subject to change and development, just as different among different races as any other beauty. *Ja: du: ha* are no rimes at all, according to the Arabic standard, while they are perfect rimes to our ear; on the other hand, we should not tolerate *saribu: kutabu: kusubu*, although they are perfect Arabic rimes. Cf. also the difference regarding *rimes riches* in French and German, etc.

After these preliminary remarks, Hildebrand proceeds to the discussion of the 'stabreim.' This he considers as falling entirely under the head of Rime. Only in it everything is reversed. The rime stands at the end of the word; the 'stabreim' at the beginning; in the rime the vowels are alike, the consonants differ; in the 'stabreim' the consonants are alike and the vowels differ. Consequently he rejects the term 'alliteration' as inadequately describing the phenomenon.³

This theory is, as far as I am aware, at variance

1. With the majority of writers on the subject (for example, Lachmann in 'Ersch u. Gröber') in claiming the qualitative identity of rime and alliteration;

2. With all authorities in requiring, for a perfect alliteration, a difference of vowels following the alliterating consonants (corresponding to the difference of consonants in the end-rime, of which so much was made above).

1. To settle the first point definitely seems in our present state of knowledge well-nigh impossible. However, there is much which

² They are, however, met with more frequently than H.'s note would lead one to think. There are about a dozen instances in Goethe's smaller poems; Heine also does not avoid them, see White's ed. (Heath). For the O.G. poets see J. Grimm, *Abh. d. k. Ak. d. W.*, Berlin, 1852, p. 521 ff., = 'Kl. Schrft.', iv, 125 ff.

³ The word, by the way, was not coined as late as the last century, as H. thinks, but was used first by Joannes Jovianus Pontanus in his dialogue 'Actius,' fol. 127b ff., of the Aldine ed. of 1519.

would support Lachmann's theory of a different origin. It is not hard to imagine that the inflectional endings must, under certain conditions, cause involuntary rimes, as is the case in many Latin pentameters; for instance, *oscula pugnabit sed tamen apta dabit* (Tib., iv, 54). Of such character seem to have been the Egyptian rimes which Ebers mentions (*Z.f. Aegypt. Spr.*, xv, p. 45). Similar rimes are occasionally found in portions of the poetical books of the Old Testament. Used at first irregularly and sporadically, they are later assigned certain places in the verse and develop thus into the poetical rime, as we have it in a Semitic inscription published by Schlottmann in the *Z.d.D.M.G.*, xxxiii and xxxiv.

Such involuntary and spontaneous origin is hardly to be assumed for the 'stabreim.' The Teutonic 'stabreim,' at least, seems to be due to a conscious effort, and intended as a mnemotechnical aid, binding together a line through its most prominent words.

The rime is usually formed by the secondary and changing elements (suffixes): the 'stabreim' by the primary and stable elements (roots), often with disregard of prefixes. There are hardly any restrictions with regard to the categories of words allowed to carry the rime, while there are quite a number of such restrictions regarding the alliterating words. In the former we have an imperfect beginning (as an occasional ornament) and a gradual development; in the latter a beginning essentially perfect and a gradual decay (into a mere ornament).

2. But let us accept, for the sake of argument, Hildebrand's theory of the qualitative identity of rime and alliteration, and examine his view regarding the difference of the vowels following the alliterating consonant. However, before applying the test of 2252 lines taken at random from most alliterating poems, it is necessary to see what we reasonably may expect to find.⁴

As was said above, the number of available words for an alliterating line is much smaller than that of riming ones for two reasons:

a. Alliteration depends on roots, not suffixes.

⁴ The chief objection which can be raised against the article is, that H. has failed to examine how far his theory, evidently based on *a priori* grounds, is borne out by the facts, he being satisfied with adducing seven instances.

A very liberal deduction ought to be made on this account.

b. Alliteration can be carried only by certain words, according to fixed rules.

From these facts it appears that it is easier to construct alliterating lines where the vowels following the alliterating consonant are different, than such in which they are alike (of the vocabulary of the poet of 'Judith,' out of ninety-six words with initial *s*, only two begin with *sae*, two with *sci*, twelve with *si*, etc.). Now, then, if there really was such a rule, or even only such a tendency, to vary the vowel, we should reasonably expect very few, if any, cases of identical vowels. When Jordan wrote his 'Nibelunge' he held the common view regarding the 'stabreim,' considering only the initial consonant as essential. This poem then, I think, furnishes material very well-suited for a determination of the relative frequency of identity of vowel in alliterating words. That is to say, the percentage of such in the 'Nibelunge' may be taken as a rough average of the frequency of identical vowels, if the poet endeavours neither to introduce nor to avoid it. An examination of five hundred lines shows that somewhat over 11% of the alliterating words have identical vowels (included are the cases of the form: *xa . . . xi xa*; in all five hundred lines there were but two lines in which three alliterating words had identical vowels). Of the alliterating phrases in Latin (collected by Wölfflin, *Sitz. d. bayer. Akad.*) less than 30% (forty out of one hundred and twenty-five) have identical vowels, but a very liberal deduction must be made, because here there are no restrictions as to the words carrying the alliteration, prefixes alliterate, and there are also many cases of etymological alliteration.

It thus appears that in about 10%-15% we should find identical vowels if they are neither purposely avoided nor sought for by the poet.

Let us now look at the statistics, which are based on the following passages: Wessobrunn Prayer, 9 vss.; Hildebrand's Lay, 65 vss.; Muspilli, 100 vss.; Judith, 350 vss.; Beowulf, 784 vss. (from different parts of the poem); Heliand, 557 vss. (from different parts of the poem); Edda, 447 vss. (Völuspá, Baldr's Dream, Guðrun's Lay, i.).

Wessobrunn Prayer, 12%; Hildebrand's Lay, 17%; Muspilli, 28%; Judith, about 14%; Beowulf, 10%; Heliand, 20%; Vǫluspá, over 6%; Baldr's Dream, 8%; Guðrun's Lay, i, 15%.

These figures go to show that in none of the poems examined did the author purposely either seek to introduce or to avoid identical vowels, but that the average percentage is such as we would expect it to be from the nature of the case, and that Hildebrand's theory, which would lead us to expect a much smaller percentage, is not sufficiently supported by facts to warrant a rejection of the old view.

There yet remains one point to be discussed. Hildebrand quotes in support of his theory a passage of Snorri Sturluson's 'Háttatal' (Hafniae, 1848, ed. Arnarn, i. 596) to the effect, that "if the höfustaf be a vowel, then the stuðlas should also be vowels and it is *more beautiful if each one of them is a different vowel*."

But I doubt, whether our author refers to æsthetic beauty at all, whether different vowels really caused a more pleasant sensation to his ear than identical ones. Much rather I am inclined to think, that he calls "beautiful" what he finds in the old poems, which he regards as faultless models. As is well known now, the vowel is not in such cases the alliterating element at all; but what really alliterates is the guttural explosive which precedes the formation of a vowel and is due to the opening of the vocal chords (the Greek smooth breathing, the Arabic hemza, the Hebrew aleph, etc.). We have seen, that in not more than ten to fifteen out of one hundred alliterating verses the vowels following the alliterating consonants are identical. The same, of course, will be the case with regard to the vowels following this guttural explosive; in eighty-five to ninety cases out of one hundred they will be different from each other. Sturluson knew nothing about the guttural explosive, he only saw that the different vowels at the beginning—as it seemed to him—of alliterating words were much more frequent than identical ones. Hence his conclusion that they were preferred, preferable or "more beautiful." If this be the case, his remark cannot be adduced in support of Hildebrand's theory.

HANNS OERTEL.

Yale University.

OLD FRENCH PHONETICS.

La méthode graphique appliquée à la recherche des transformations inconscientes du langage, par M. L'ABBÉ ROUSSELOT.

La Phonétique expérimentale et la philologie Franco-Provençale par M. KOSCHWITZ; contained in a reprint of the *Compte-rendu du Congrès scientifique international des catholiques*, tenu à Paris du 1^{er} au 6 avril 1891. Paris: Picard, 1891. 24 pp.

THE first of these two articles represents an address delivered by the Abbé Rousselot, co-editor with M. Gilliéron of the *Revue des Patois Gallo-Romans*, before the Catholic congress held in Paris during the month of April of last year. M. Rousselot dwells on the importance of a physical study of speech, which must form the basis of all historical study, and refers to certain mechanical appliances, invented by him and others, that register the movements which the different organs of speech undergo. This apparatus is of the most ingenious kind, and has been more fully described by M. Rousselot in the above-mentioned *Revue*, fascs. 14 and 15, where he also shows its possible application in a study of his native patois, that of Cellerouin. Not feeling myself competent to express any definite opinion on the matter, I would refer the reader to the article in question for further information.

Dr. Koschwitz continues the same theme, and speaks of the importance of such study as that undertaken by M. Rousselot, and emphasizes the fact, that every linguist, in order to be able to cope with the problems which he will encounter, must of necessity pay attention, and a great deal of attention, to the physiology of the organs of speech, and must "d'abord se faire naturaliste, physicien et physiologiste." These methods must at first be applied to the study of living forms of speech, and the information thus gained transferred to the study of the older stages of language. This leads him to speak of the difficulty which every student of French phonology experiences, when he endeavors to compare any modern dialect with the literary language, or with older dialects. The modern patois of Northern France have undergone so marked changes in their rapidity of growth under purely phonetic influences, analogical contamination, or mixture with